

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 ALEXANDER OCASIO,)
10 Plaintiff,) 3:09-cv-00179-LRH-VPC
11 vs.)
12 ANN E. ZIMMERMAN, *et al.*,) ORDER
13 Defendants.) /

15 Plaintiff, an inmate at Ely State Prison, is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this
16 civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 5, 2009, the court entered an order and
17 judgment dismissing this action with prejudice (Docket #3, #4). Pending before the court is
18 plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b). (Docket #7).

19 Plaintiff brought this action against two individuals: Judge Ann E. Zimmerman of the Las
20 Vegas Justice Court, and Small Claims Clerk Sharon Powers. Judges are absolutely immune from
21 damages actions for judicial acts taken within the jurisdiction of their courts. *Schucker v. Rockwood*,
22 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988); *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 418 (1976). Court clerks
23 have absolute quasi-judicial immunity from damages for civil rights violations when they perform
24 tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process. *Mullis v. United States Bankruptcy Court*, 828
25 F.2d 1385 (9th Cir. 1987); *Morrison v. Jones*, 607 F.2d 1269, 1273 (9th Cir. 1979), *cert. denied*, 445
26 U.S. 962 (1980). In the order dismissing this action with prejudice, the court explained as follows:

27 In this case, plaintiff alleges various civil rights violations by defendants
28 Zimmerman and Powers in the processing of his action in Las Vegas Justice Court. The court finds that both defendants are immune from plaintiff's action for damages against them

1 in connection with this action. The court further finds that to the extent that plaintiff wishes
2 to challenge the outcome of his action in small claims court, he must do so through the
3 appellate process within the Nevada state court system. Finally, the court notes that
4 prisoners' right of access to the courts is limited to the pleading stage of a civil rights action
5 or petition for writ of habeas corpus. *Cornett v. Donovan*, 51 F.3d 894, 898 (9th Cir. 1995).
6 Plaintiff therefore does not have a Constitutional right to litigate in small claims court, and
7 his claim based on denial of access to that court is without a legal basis.

8 In his motion for relief from judgment, plaintiff argues that defendants' alleged constitutional
9 violations are so egregious that they are outside the scope of any judicial or quasi-judicial function.
10 The court finds no merit to plaintiff's argument. The actions of which plaintiff complains are
11 judicial or quasi-judicial in nature, taken in the scope of defendants' official capacities. Accordingly,
12 the court finds no basis for relief from judgment.

13 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment is
14 **DENIED** (Docket #7).

15 Dated this 13th day of July, 2009.



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28